arXiv:math-ph/0009007v3 24 Feb 2002

Occam's Razor as a formal basis for a physical theory

Andrei N. Soklakov*

Department of Mathematics
Royal Holloway, University of London
Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom

26 September 2001

We introduce the principle of Occam's Razor in a form which can be used as a basis for economical formulations of physics. This allows us to explain the general structure of the Lagrangian for a composite physical system, as well as some other artificial postulates behind the variational formulations of physical laws. As an example, we derive Hamilton's principle of stationary action together with the Lagrangians for the cases of Newtonian mechanics, relativistic mechanics and a relativistic particle in an external gravitational field.

PACS: 45.05.+x, 45.20.-d, 45.50.-j, 89.70.+c

1 Introduction

The standard derivation of the laws of motion from the principle of least action is a cornerstone of all major physical theories. However, this derivation is based on a number of postulates which are too unnatural to be considered as axioms. For instance, why at the fundamental level does the Lagrangian L of a composite system always have the form $L = L^1 + L^2 - V$, where L^1 and L^2 are the Lagrangians of free subsystems and V accounts for the interaction? Indeed, what meaning can we assign to the difference between kinetic and potential energy, which is used as a template for many physical Lagrangians? Furthermore, why is the action defined as an integral of L, and why do we obtain correct classical equations by minimizing this integral? These questions are equally important in almost every theory which uses Lagrangian formulation. We may therefore hope that the answers to these questions can be useful in finding the ultimate physical theory.

*e-mail: a.soklakov@rhul.ac.uk

According to Occam's Razor, simple theories are more economical and are usually better suited for making predictions. Indeed, all fundamental laws of physics are surprisingly simple in form. In this paper we introduce Occam's Razor in a form of a physical principle that we call the *simplicity principle* (*SP*). Using the *SP* we answer the above questions: we explain the structure of the Lagrangian of a composite physical system together with the other postulates behind the Hamilton's principle of stationary action. In this sense we derive the Hamilton's principle of stationary action.

As a first step, we introduce the standard notion of the state space of a mechanical system and derive Newton's second law from just two extra postulates, namely the *SP* and the Galilean relativity principle. The purpose of this derivation is to demonstrate our approach using the particularly well known case of Newtonian mechanics. The important contribution from our approach is that the mathematical structure of the *SP* alone implies that all fundamental interactions can be accounted for by adding an extra term to the Lagrangian. This result is *independent* of the particular theory. In other words, different theories correspond to different Lagrangians for free elementary systems, whereas the *SP* tells us how to introduce interactions between them. This means, for instance, that in applying our theory for the relativistic case it is enough to consider one particle cases, such as a free relativistic particle and a relativistic particle in an external gravitational field. The rest of the arguments follow simply by replacing Galilean relativity with Einstein's principle of relativity and his principle of equivalence.

2 Dynamical laws and the Simplicity Principle

The task of theoretical physics is to find algorithms that can correctly reproduce or predict experimental data. However, not every such algorithm can be considered satisfactory, as real understanding implies that a minimal set of simple axioms is found and all experimental results can be reproduced as a consequence of these axioms. The axioms should introduce a *state model* able to describe the system instantaneously, and *the dynamical laws* that describe any physical changes of the system's state. Since the set of evolution histories is incomparably more numerous than the set of system states, the complexity of the system dynamics given the system state model can be very large. In this context it is not trivial that all fundamental laws of physics should be simple in form, yet this is true for *all known* fundamental laws, even ones as diverse as gravitation and quantum mechanics. In this paper we propose to use this fact as a common ground for the laws of physics.

Given a physical system, consider the set $\mathbb{S} = \{\xi\}$ of *all* states in which the system can be prepared or experimentally found. We thereby require that each $\xi \in \mathbb{S}$ contains a *complete* description of a system state. This means that there can be no hidden information (such as the preparation history) that would distinguish otherwise identical system states. A function $f : \mathbb{S} \to \mathbb{S}\times\mathbb{S}\times\mathbb{S}\times\cdots$ is called a dynamical law if, for any initial state $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{S}$, the value $f(\xi_0)$ is an ordered sequence $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots\}$, $\xi_k \in \mathbb{S}$. Physically, $f(\xi_0)$ defines a trajectory in $\mathbb{S}$ associated with the initial state ξ_0.

By the definition of $\mathbb{S}$, we assign the same physical meaning to a system state regardless of its preparation history. In other words, if the system passes through an intermediate state ξ_i then the predicted evolution following ξ_i should not depend on how the system reached ξ_i. For each dynamical law f that satisfies this requirement we can find a function g such that for every two consecutive points ξ_i and ξ_{i+1} in the trajectory $f(\xi_0)$ we have $\xi_{i+1} = g(\xi_i)$. For further reference we will call such laws Markovian. It is clear that without loss of generality we can consider only Markovian laws. This is because the preparation history can always be included in the description of the system state, in which case the the evolution will be Markovian.

Not all dynamical laws describe the actual system evolution equally well. Considering the set of all possible dynamics as a hypothesis space, we may follow one of the standard approaches in the formal induction theory [1]. For instance, we can try to find a single law which, by some criterion, is better than any other law. Alternatively, we can try to use the individual predictions of each possible law and formulate our final prediction by averaging over all individual predictions using some "prior" probability distribution. In this paper we follow the strategy of singling out only one dynamical law and leave the second, more general approach, for the discussion of further research on quantization (section 5).

In order to discriminate between different dynamical laws, we postulate that the most economical set of axioms for a physical theory includes the simplicity principle (*SP*): *among all dynamical laws that are consistent with all the other axioms, the laws with the smallest descriptional complexity predominate the system's behavior*. The *SP* has philosophical and historical roots in Occam's Razor, which was stated by Isaac Newton as Rule I for natural philosophy in his famous *Principia*. Relatively recently, Occam's Razor became a cornerstone of the modern theory of induction and computational learning as introduced by Solomonoff [2] in 1964 (see also Ref. [3] for a thorough review including more recent developments).

In contrast to computational learning, we do not analyze a collection of raw experimental data. Using the examples of Newtonian and relativistic mechan-

ics, we demonstrate that only the most general axioms (such as the Galilean relativity principle or Einstein's relativity principles) are sufficient to complete the theory if combined with the *SP*. Physics enters our formalism both through the definition of the "state space" $\mathbb{S}$ of the system and through the relativity principles; these are taken as experimental facts. The *SP* provides an inference tool for finding the simplest dynamical theory consistent with these experimental facts.

The main weakness of this paper is a rather artificial proof that there is no contradiction in using Kolmogorov complexity to quantify the complexity of dynamical laws in the case of Newtonian mechanics. The requirement of Galilean relativity appears as a constraint on the complexity of physical dynamics. Even though this constraint is mathematically consistent and can be satisfied, it appears to be rather artificial in the framework of algorithmic information theory. This does not occur in the relativistic case which naturally follows from an absolutely analogous yet technically simpler analysis. We suspect that the difficulties in the Newtonian case arise from the special role of time, although a more suitable measure of complexity of dynamical laws probably can be proposed.

3 Mathematical background and key ideas

To formulate the *SP* mathematically we need a measure of complexity which can be assigned to individual objects (as we need to discriminate between particular laws). In 1963-1965, A. N. Kolmogorov (see e.g. [4]) proposed to consider this problem in the framework of the general theory of algorithms. Similar results were obtained by R. J. Solomonoff [5, 2], and by G. J. Chaitin [6]; these three authors had different motivations and worked independently from one another [1]. Significant progress has been made to improve the original definitions of complexity so as to increase the range of applications. For the purpose of this paper we will use the prefix version of Kolmogorov complexity which was introduced by Levin [7], Gacs [8] and Chaitin [9].

All the key properties of prefix complexity that are necessary for our results are summarized by Eq. (6). This is important because Eq. (6) represents a very typical property of information in both algorithmic and probabilistic approaches. This property is often illustrated by Venn diagrams which make Eq. (6) a very natural requirement for any information-theoretic measure of complexity. In physics, we often deal with integrable, differentiable and even smooth functions. Kolmogorov complexity can be interpolated by such functions only in special cases, and under some severe restrictions on its arguments. This fact makes it difficult to work with Kolmogorov complexity even though

Eq. (6) is all we really need at this stage. We therefore acknowledge that by using an alternative measure of complexity which obeys Eq. (6) we may considerably simplify the arguments of this paper. In the first reading, we recommend noting property (6) and proceeding with subsection 3.3, skipping the following subsection.

3.1 Prefix Kolmogorov Complexity

In this subsection we review the definition and some important properties of the prefix complexity. Let $\mathbb{X} = \{\Lambda, 0, 1, 00, 01, 10, 11, 000, \dots\}$ be the set of finite binary strings where Λ is the string of length 0. Any subset of $\mathbb{X}$ is called a code. Any string in a code has a well defined length and the set of string lengths is an important characteristic of the code. An instantaneous code is a set of strings $\mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{X}$ with the property that no string in $\mathbb{Y}$ is a prefix of another. A prefix computer is a partial recursive function[1] $C : \mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{X}$. For each $p \in \mathbb{Y}$ (program string) and for each $d \in \mathbb{X}$ (data string) the output of the computation is either undefined or given by $C(p, d) \in \mathbb{X}$. Following the usual motivation [1], we restrict our attention to prefix computers. This is a very weak restriction in the sense that every uniquely decodable code can be replaced by an instantaneous code without changing the set of string lengths [1]. Consider a mathematical object that has a binary string α as its complete description. The idea is to choose some reference computer C, find the shortest program that makes C compute α given data d, and use the length $K_C(\alpha|d)$ of the program (in bits) as the measure of the object's complexity. Formally, the complexity of α given data d relative to computer C is

$$K_C(\alpha|d) \equiv \min_p \{|p| \;\big|\; C(p, d) = \alpha\}\,, \tag{1}$$

where $|p|$ denotes the length of the program p (in bits).

Since this complexity measure depends strongly on the reference computer, it is important to find an optimal computer U for which $K_U(\alpha|d) \leq K_C(\alpha|d) + \kappa_C$ for any prefix computer C and for all α and d, where κ_C is a constant depending on C (and U) but not on α or d. It turns out that the set of prefix computers contains such a U and, moreover, it can be constructed so that any prefix computer can be simulated by U: for further details consult [1]. Such a U is called a universal prefix computer and its choice is not unique. Using some particular universal prefix computer U as a reference, we define the conditional Kolmogorov complexity of α given β as $K_U(\alpha|\beta)$.

[1] A partial function which is computed by a Turing machine.

The above definitions are generalized for the case of many strings as follows. We choose and fix a particular recursive bijection $B : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{X}$. Let $\{\alpha^i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a set of n strings $\alpha^i \in \mathbb{X}$. For $2 \leq k \leq n$ we define $\langle \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \ldots, \alpha^k \rangle \equiv B(\langle \alpha^1, \ldots, \alpha^{k-1} \rangle, \alpha^k)$, and $\langle \alpha^1 \rangle \equiv \alpha^1$. We can now define $K_U(\alpha^1, \ldots, \alpha^n | \beta^1, \ldots, \beta^k) \equiv K_U(\langle \alpha^1, \ldots, \alpha^n \rangle | \langle \beta^1, \ldots, \beta^k \rangle)$.

For any two universal prefix computers U_1 and U_2 we have, by definition, $|K_{U_1}(\alpha|\beta) - K_{U_2}(\alpha|\beta)| \leq \kappa(U_1, U_2)$ where $\kappa(U_1, U_2)$ is a constant that depends only on U_1 and U_2 and not on α or β. In many standard applications of Kolmogorov complexity the set of reference computers is considered to be finite and the attention is focused on complex objects such as random or nearly random long strings. In such cases, Kolmogorov complexity becomes an asymptotically absolute measure of the complexity of individual strings: the constant $\kappa(U_1, U_2)$ can be neglected in comparison to the value of the complexity. For this reason, many fundamental properties of Kolmogorov complexity are established up to an error term which can be neglected compared to the complexity of the considered strings. For instance, the standard analysis of the prefix Kolmogorov complexity ([1], Section 3.9.2) gives

$$K_U(\alpha, \gamma|\beta) = K_U(\alpha|\gamma, \beta) + K_U(\gamma|\beta) + \Delta\,, \tag{2}$$

where Δ is the error term which grows logarithmically with the complexity of considered strings. In our case such accuracy is unacceptable as we want to use K_U to analyze simple dynamical laws for which the complexity is small and terms like Δ cannot be neglected. Fortunately, in the case of simple strings (see Definition 1 in Ref. [10]) this problem can be solved by a natural restriction of reference computers [10]. Roughly speaking, this restriction entails the requirement that switching to a more complex reference computer should always be accompanied by an equivalent reduction of program lengths, i.e. more complex computers are required to be more "powerful". Denoting a set of computers which satisfies this requirement by $\{W_s\}$ we then construct a computer W which is universal for this set by setting $W(p, \langle s, d \rangle) = W_s(p, d)$ and use any such W as a reference. By a slight abuse of notation, for any simple pair of strings (α, γ), we have by Theorem 1 in Ref. [10]:

$$K_W(\alpha, \gamma|\beta) = K_W(\alpha|\gamma, \beta) + K_W(\gamma|\beta) + \text{const}\,, \tag{3}$$

where the constant depends only on the reference machine W (not on α, β or γ).

It is important to keep in mind that Kolmogorov complexity becomes a particular function only if the reference computer is given. A set of reference computers defines a set of complexity functions which have some properties in common, e.g. Eq. (3), but nevertheless, individual complexity functions can

look very different from one another. In order to verify whether any particular function $G : \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{N}$ is a Kolmogorov measure of complexity it is necessary and sufficient to find a reference computer W such that $K_W = G$. The rest of this subsection deals with the properties that are common to all complexity functions defined by the set of reference computers $\{W\}$.

For any particular reference computer W, we can simplify the notation $K \equiv K_W$ and use (3) to show that

$$\begin{aligned} K(\alpha^1, \ldots, \alpha^N|d) &= K(\alpha^N|d) + K(\alpha^1, \ldots, \alpha^{N-1}|\alpha^N, d) + \text{const} \\ &= \cdots \\ &= K(\alpha^N|d) + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} K(\alpha^{N-n}|\alpha^{N-n+1}, \ldots, \alpha^N, d) + \text{const} \\ &= K(\alpha^N|d) + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} K(\alpha^n|\alpha^{n+1}, \ldots, \alpha^N, d) + \text{const}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Defining the conditional mutual information of objects α and $\gamma^1, \gamma^2, \ldots, \gamma^N$ as

$$I(\alpha : \gamma^1, \ldots, \gamma^N|d) \equiv K(\alpha|d) - K(\alpha|\gamma^1, \ldots, \gamma^N, d) \tag{5}$$

(consult Ref. [1]) we have

$$K(\alpha^1, \ldots, \alpha^N|d) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} K(\alpha^n|d) - \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} I(\alpha^n : \alpha^{n+1}, \ldots, \alpha^N|d) + \text{const}. \tag{6}$$

This equation will soon become important for the complexity analysis of dynamical laws.

3.2 Complexity of dynamical laws

Recall that a dynamical law was defined earlier as a function on the state space of the system. If we had a definition of the complexity of a function we would therefore be able to quantify the complexity of a dynamical law. For any function ${}^Jf : \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{X}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{X}_J$ ($\mathbb{X}_j = \mathbb{X}$), the complexity of ${}^Jf$ at $x_0 \in \mathbb{X}$ is defined as

$$K_{x_0}[{}^Jf] \equiv \frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=0}^{J-1} K(x_{k+1}|x_k)\,, \tag{7}$$

where the ordered sequence $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_J\} = {}^Jf(x_0)$. It is helpful to illustrate this definition for the case of Markovian laws as defined in section 2. If ${}^Jf$

is Markovian, then by definition there exists a function $g : \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{X}$ such that $x_{k+1} = g(x_k)$ and we have

$$K_{x_0}[{}^J f] = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=0}^{J-1} K_{x_k}[g] \,. \tag{8}$$

The complexity of ${}^J f$ is therefore equal to the complexity of g at a typical point in the trajectory $\{x_0, \ldots, x_J\}$. In other words, the complexity of ${}^J f$ at x_0 quantifies the amount of information needed to compute a typical step of the trajectory generated by ${}^J f$ from the initial condition x_0.

3.3 Key ideas

Before we introduce our derivation of Newtonian mechanics, it is relevant to recall the definition of a Newtonian mechanical system and highlight the conceptual difficulties of the standard approach. A Newtonian mechanical system consists of particles whose dimensions can be neglected in describing their motion. The position of a particle in space is defined by its Cartesian coordinates $\boldsymbol{r} = (x, y, z)$. The derivative $\dot{\boldsymbol{r}} = (\dot{x}, \dot{y}, \dot{z}) \equiv (dx/dt, dy/dt, dz/dt)$ of the coordinates with respect to time t is called the Cartesian velocity of the particle. The physical state of the system is completely determined if the coordinates and the velocities are determined for every particle in the system. For every mechanical system one can write a function of its state that together with an appropriate dynamical principle defines the system evolution. This function is called the Lagrangian of the system and is usually postulated, except for a few special cases where it can be derived. For example, one can show that the Lagrangian of a single free particle is proportional to its squared velocity. This fact is a direct consequence of the Galilean principle of relativity and the classical definitions of homogeneous isotropic space and homogeneous time (Ref. [11], §3,4). Unfortunately, this is about all one can explain using the standard approach. Certainly, we have no satisfactory explanation of why the Lagrangian of a mechanical system has the accepted form $L = T - V$ and why we minimize a functional of "action" which is an integral of L along a short segment of a path. Indeed, the standard derivation of the equations of motion from the principle of stationary action uses Newton's second law as an established fact [12]. An analogous situation is found in the standard derivation of the equations of wave mechanics in the Lagrangian formulation [13]. It may seem that the Lagrangian formulation of the laws of dynamics is merely one way of writing them down. Nevertheless, the Lagrangian formulation plays an important role in *understanding* the physical world in many areas due to

its truly remarkable ability of unifying various types of interactions. Quoting R. P. Feynman [14] "We regard the action to be the more fundamental quantity. From it we can immediately read off the rules for the propagators, the coupling, and the equations of motion. *But we still do not know the reason*[2] for the rules for the diagrams, or why we can get the propagators out of $\mathtt{S}$ [the action]". Whatever the physical interaction, if it is well defined and understood, it is often enough to add one extra term in the Lagrangian to describe it.

Adding interaction terms to free Lagrangians is a rather specific way of introducing interactions. In conservative nonrelativistic mechanics, for example, interactions are typically considered as functions of the *relative* positions of the interacting subsystems (Ref. [11], §5). Lagrangians of free subsystems are functions of a different type: they can only depend on the *absolute* states describing each subsystem individually. The total Lagrangian, including interaction, is constructed as a difference between free Lagrangians and interaction terms. Not every function of the combined system state can be represented in this way.

We suggest that property (6) of complexity measures may provide an explanation for the general structure of the Lagrangian for a composite physical system. Considering, for instance, a pair of strings α^1 and α^2, we have from (6) that the complexity of them both given any data d is given by

$$K(\alpha^1, \alpha^2|d) = K(\alpha^1|d) + K(\alpha^2|d) - I(\alpha^1 : \alpha^2|d) + \text{const} \ , \tag{9}$$

where the first two terms represent the complexities of α^1 and α^2 considered independently from one another. The third term $I(\alpha^1 : \alpha^2|d)$ quantifies the strength of correlation between the two strings which can be viewed as an amount of information in one string about the other, given initial knowledge d. A typical action of a composite physical system has the same structure. For the action $\mathtt{S}^{1,2}$ of a bipartite system we would normally write

$$\mathtt{S}^{1,2} = \mathtt{S}^1 + \mathtt{S}^2 - \mathtt{S}^{\text{int}} + \text{const} \ , \tag{10}$$

where $\mathtt{S}^1$ and $\mathtt{S}^2$ are the actions for individual subsystems, $\mathtt{S}^{\text{int}}$ is the interaction term, and the constant can be arbitrary. The similarity between (9) and (10) becomes even more apparent if we think of correlation between two strings α^1 and α^2 as a manifestation of interaction. To be more precise, we can use the strings α^1 and α^2 to describe dynamical laws g^1 and g^2 of individual subsystems by setting $\alpha^k = g^k(d)$. Using (9) and the definition of complexity of a dynamical law (section 3.2), we have

$$K_d[g^1, g^2] = K_d[g^1] + K_d[g^2] - I_d[g^1 : g^2] + \text{const} \ , \tag{11}$$

[2]Italics introduced by this author and not in the original text.

where $I_d[g^1 : g^2] \equiv I(\alpha^1 : \alpha^2|d)$ quantifies the strength of correlation between the two dynamical laws governing the interacting subsystems. We draw special attention to the fact that the property given by Eq. (9) is rather typical for information-theoretic measures of complexity and can be easily understood using Venn diagrams. We can therefore anticipate that the structure of action for a composite physical system (10) can be understood as a consequence of a more general property, namely the structure of complexity of dynamical laws governing the behaviour of the system.

In this article, we develop the proposed approach considering a particular measure of complexity, namely Kolmogorov complexity. Our choice of this measure is based on the fact that Kolmogorov complexity was specifically designed for quantification of the complexity of individual objects, as opposed to alternative probabilistic approaches. The price we pay is a rather difficult or, more likely, unusual mathematical formalism. Kolmogorov complexity is defined with respect to a "reference computer"; it is an essentially discrete quantity; and there is no algorithm which can compute this quantity in the most general case. It is hard to imagine a more difficult quantity in the realm of physics where we are used to integrable, differentiable or even smooth functions.

We have already mentioned that the Galilean relativity principle plays a key role in the derivation of the Lagrangian of a single nonrelativistic particle but alone it is not enough to explain all the postulates of the Hamilton's principle of least action. Using a simple example of a conservative nonrelativistic system we show that the Galilean relativity principle can be combined with the *SP* to answer the questions posed at the beginning of this article. The structure of the complexity of the dynamical laws given by Eq. (11) explains the general structure of the Lagrangian of a composite system; the integral in the definition of the action corresponds to the sum in Eq. (8); and the minimization procedure corresponds to finding the simplest dynamical law (consistent with the Galilean relativity). These arguments only deal with the structure of the Hamilton's principle and can be applied beyond nonrelativistic mechanics. In the relativistic case, for instance, the same arguments apply, the only difference being that the Galilean relativity principle is replaced with the relativistic principles of Einstein.

It can already be seen from this introduction that the invariance of action associated with a particular relativity principle must be satisfied by the measure of complexity of the dynamical laws. This is the point where the technical difficulties associated with the use of Kolmogorov complexity appear. In principle, by choosing an appropriate reference computer, it is possible to set the Kolmogorov complexity to any function at any *finite* set of strings. The problem is that it can be difficult to construct a "natural" example of such a computer. The good news is that the relativity principles have nothing to do with the

properties of action like the structure (10). This means that in order to check the consistency of the *SP* with a particular relativity principle it is sufficient to consider only the free particle case.

In our derivation of Newton's second law we construct a rather artificial example of a reference computer which satisfies all the constraints imposed by the Galilean relativity principle on the complexity of physical laws. It is interesting, however, that the complications encountered in the case of Newtonian mechanics disappear in the relativistic case, even though the arguments are absolutely analogous. Mathematically, this is due to the fact that the square of the four-velocity of a relativistic particle is always equal to one, whereas the squared velocity of a nonrelativistic particle, which appears in the Lagrangian, depends on the reference frame. It is tempting to assume that the special role of time in Newtonian mechanics is to blame for the complications. At the moment, however, there is no evidence that the reference computer in the nonrelativistic case cannot be constructed in a more elegant way.

In conclusion of this section, it is important to emphasize that, in this article, we use only a small fraction of Kolmogorov complexity calculus. Kolmogorov complexity is rich in properties which can be useful in fundamental physics. As a simple example, consider the Kraft inequality which demands that the sums of the type $\sum_f 2^{-K_x[f]}$ are convergent. The proposed analogy between Kolmogorov complexity and action suggests that the Kraft inequality may be useful in the context of the path integral approach (see section 5 for some details).

4 Main derivations

Given a physical system, consider the set $\mathbb{S}$ of all possible states of the system. For any initial state $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{S}$ and for any dynamical law f the entire system evolution is given by the trajectory $f(\xi_0) = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots\}$ in the "state space" $\mathbb{S}$ of the system. This definition is general enough in that a continuous trajectory can be defined as a sequence of points ξ_s, where s is a continuous parameter. In the case of a composite system, one can also introduce state spaces and dynamical laws for every subsystem. In general, these dynamical laws are not independent but correlated due to physical interaction between the subsystems. One way to study that correlation in detail is the complexity analysis based on the earlier defined notion of Kolmogorov complexity of a function. In this case a coarse-graining of the state space is often necessary as we need finite binary strings $\bar{\xi}_k$ to address the points ξ_k in $\mathbb{S}$ which is often a continuum. It is convenient to identify binary strings with the coarse-grained numerical

values they represent. One can also assume, without loss of generality, that the coarse-graining of the state space can be performed as fine as necessary at the cost of increasing the length of the binary strings used.

Let a sequence of finite binary strings $\bar{\xi}_0, \bar{\xi}_1, \ldots, \bar{\xi}_J$ represent some $J+1$ points of a coarse-grained trajectory in the state space. A function ${}^Jf : \mathbb{S} \to \mathbb{S}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{S}_J$ ($\mathbb{S}_j = \mathbb{S}$) of the collective variable $\bar{\xi}$ defines a coarse-grained dynamical law if

$$ {}^Jf(\bar{\xi}_0) = \{\bar{\xi}_1, \bar{\xi}_2, \ldots, \bar{\xi}_J\}. \tag{12}$$

In the standard approach we consider a set of continuous differentiable trajectories with fixed initial and final conditions. Such trajectories can obviously be approximated to any degree of accuracy by the ${}^Jf$-type of functions. To get a better approximation all we need to do is to increase the length of binary strings, keep $\bar{\xi}_0$ and $\bar{\xi}_J$ fixed while adding more points in between. Formally we write

$$ f = \lim_{J\to\infty} \lim_{|\bar{\xi}|\to\infty} {}^Jf\,, \tag{13}$$

where the limit indicates that the continuous trajectory $f(\xi_0)$ has an infinite number of points ($J \to \infty$) each specified to an infinite accuracy ($|\bar{\xi}| \equiv \sum_k |\bar{\xi}_k| \to \infty$). In any situation when we are interested in continuous laws, we would normally start from the continuous trajectory $f(\xi_0)$ so there is no ambiguity in the definition of the limit.

According to the definition of complexity of a function (subsection 3.1), the complexity of a coarse-grained dynamical law ${}^Jf$ is given by

$$ K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[\,{}^Jf\,] = \frac{1}{J}\sum_{k=0}^{J-1} K(\bar{\xi}_{k+1}|\bar{\xi}_k)\,. \tag{14}$$

The *SP* can now be formulated as a variational problem of minimizing $K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^Jf]$ over all dynamical laws $\{{}^Jf\}$ that are consistent with all other physical axioms. It is important to acknowledge that the *SP* is just an inference tool and additional axioms are needed for finding physical dynamics. It is for this reason that we cannot narrow the set of dynamical laws down to the trivial law $(\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_{k+1}) = (\boldsymbol{r}_k, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_k)$, which is intuitively the simplest. In Newtonian mechanics, for instance, the minimal set of axioms includes the *SP and* the Galilean relativity principle. The trivial law would violate the Galilean relativity principle as a particle cannot be at rest in more than one reference frame.

4.1 Newtonian Mechanics

Consider the state space of a Newtonian mechanical system where time, positions and velocities of the particles are combined into a collective variable[3] $\xi \equiv (\boldsymbol{r}, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}, t)$ to represent every possible state of the system [15]. Each point $\bar{\xi}_k$ of a coarse-grained trajectory approximates a point $\xi_k \equiv (\boldsymbol{r}_k, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_k, t_k)$ in the state space. We can therefore define $\bar{\xi}_k \equiv \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_k, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_k, \bar{t}_k \rangle$ where $\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_k$, $\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_k$ and $\bar{t}_k$ are finite binary strings approximating the values of $\boldsymbol{r}_k$, $\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_k$ and t_k in the real-parameter state space.

We shall follow the standard approach and choose the time $t \equiv \bar{t}_k$ instead of an abstract parameter k to define the order of events $\{\bar{\xi}_k\}$ in the trajectory ${}^J f(\bar{\xi}_0)$. This reflects the absolute nature of time in Newtonian mechanics and is not a necessary requirement of our approach. We put all elements of the set $\{t\}$ in order such that for any two consecutive times t and $t + \Delta t$ we have $\Delta t > 0$. For any function of time ϕ_t we define $\Delta\phi_t \equiv \phi_t - \phi_{t-\Delta t}$ and the *discrete time derivative* is defined as

$$\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t \equiv \frac{\Delta \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t}{\Delta t} = \frac{\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t - \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t}}{\Delta t} \ . \tag{15}$$

We see that if $|\bar{\xi}| \equiv \sum_k |\bar{\xi}_k|$ is taken to infinity one can chose the lengths of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_k\}$ and $\{\bar{t}_k\}$ such that $\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ approaches $\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$. This fact is used every time we approximate derivatives by ratios of finite differences on a computer. Formally we write

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \lim_{|\bar{\xi}| \to \infty} \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t \ , \tag{16}$$

where, as in the case of Eq. (13), the double limit means that, in practice, sufficiently long binary strings ($|\bar{\xi}| \to \infty$) should be used for any finite Δt (i.e., longer strings are needed for better precision). Equation (16) suggests that the above definition of $\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ can be used for construction of $\bar{\xi}_t \equiv \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t \rangle$ which is by definition a coarse-grained approximation of $\xi_t = \langle \boldsymbol{r}_t, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t \rangle$. The second discrete time derivative is, by analogy, defined as

$$\mathring{\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}}_t \equiv \frac{\Delta \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t}{\Delta t} = \frac{\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t - \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t}}{\Delta t} \ . \tag{17}$$

In the new parameterization Eq. (14) becomes

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f] = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{t=\bar{t}_0}^{\bar{t}_{J-1}} K(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}, t + \Delta t | \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t) \ , \tag{18}$$

[3]Here we omit the subscript enumerating the particles for the sake of convenience of notation.

where the sum over t goes through the set $\{\bar{t}_k\}_{k=0}^{J-1}$; we choose for simplicity $t \equiv \bar{t}_k = k\Delta t$, where Δt is now a constant. Like any other re-parameterization, this relation can be absorbed into the definition of the reference computer in the form of a subroutine which is always executed to calculate $t + \Delta t$ given t. Equation (18) becomes

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f] = \frac{1}{\bar{t}_J - \bar{t}_0} \sum_{t=\bar{t}_0}^{\bar{t}_{J-1}} K(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t} | \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t)\, \Delta t \ . \tag{19}$$

It is also convenient to absorb the definitions of discrete time derivatives, Eqs. (15) and (17), into the definition of the reference computer. In this case $\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}$ can be set for automatic evaluation from $\mathring{\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}}_{t+\Delta t}$ given $\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$. We therefore have

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f] = \frac{1}{\bar{t}_J - \bar{t}_0} \sum_{t=\bar{t}_0}^{\bar{t}_{J-1}} K(\mathring{\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}}_{t+\Delta t} | \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t)\, \Delta t \ . \tag{20}$$

Let us fix the time $\tau \equiv t_J - t_0$ in which we investigate the system evolution. We have

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f] = \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{t=0}^{\tau-\Delta t} K(\mathring{\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}}_{t+\Delta t} | \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t)\, \Delta t \ , \tag{21}$$

where the sum over t goes from 0 to $\tau - \Delta t$ in steps of Δt. From this equation we can already see that the complexity of dynamical laws is determined by the complexity of the acceleration $\mathring{\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}}_{t+\Delta t}$ given the system state $\bar{\xi}_t = \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t \rangle$ in the immediately preceding past.

Consider the simple example of a single free particle which at the instants 0 and τ is in the states $\bar{\xi}_0$ and $\bar{\xi}_\tau$ respectively. The physical dynamics which are to be found by minimizing $K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f]$ over all ${}^J f$ with fixed $\bar{\xi}_0$ and $\bar{\xi}_\tau$ should satisfy the Galilean relativity principle. This restricts the set of dynamics $\{{}^J f\}$ to those for which

$$K(\mathring{\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}}_{t+\Delta t} | \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t) = \frac{m \mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^2}{2} + \frac{\Delta Q(\bar{\xi}_t)}{\Delta t} \ , \tag{22}$$

where m is a positive coefficient and $Q(\bar{\xi}_t)$ is an arbitrary function of the state of the system. Before we proceed with the proof of this, it is relevant to recall the Galilean relativity principle.

The Galilean relativity principle is based on the notion of *inertial reference frames* in which, by definition, the laws of mechanics take their simplest form (Ref. [11], §3). Mathematically, inertial reference frames are defined through

a number of properties which are known commonly as Newton's First law. These properties imply homogeneity and isotropy of space and homogeneity of time. Moreover, in the inertial reference frame where a free body is at rest at some instant it remains always at rest. And finally, the coordinates $\boldsymbol{r}$ and $\boldsymbol{r}'$ of a given point in two different inertial frames are related by the Galilean transform

$$\boldsymbol{r} = \boldsymbol{r}' + \boldsymbol{v}t \ , \tag{23}$$

where it is understood that time is the same in the two frames ($t = t'$) and that the second frame moves relative to the first one with velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$. It follows directly from these definitions that velocity of a free particle is constant in any inertial frame, i.e. $\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t} = 0$.

The proof of equation (22) is constructed as follows. Suppose we want to interpolate $K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t)$ by some well behaved function L_1 which is defined on real numbers, but coincides with $K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t)$ on the coarse-grained trajectory where K is defined. Assuming that such an L_1 exists, we determine its properties and prove that on the coarse-grained state space it would behave as suggested by Eq. (22). We then show that there exist infinitely many reference computers for which K is consistent with Eq. (22). In such cases the interpolation L_1 of K can be found as assumed, because it is uniquely (up to the total time derivative) defined by Eq. (22). In summary, we demonstrate that by choosing an appropriate reference computer W, the complexity measure K can be made to satisfy all the requirements imposed by the Galilean relativity principle in the framework of the *SP*. In this argument we use the standard formulation of the Galilean relativity principle on the continuum. Alternatively, we could reformulate the Galilean relativity principle in a discrete form and try to apply it directly to K without introducing L_1. This will be considered in future research. However for now, we shall keep the standard formulation of the Galilean relativity principle on the continuum, and demonstrate the relation between the continuous and the discrete formulations of Newtonian mechanics. Later we will see that in the relativistic case all the arguments can be performed without introducing L_1.

For our case of a single free particle we have $\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t} = 0$, and therefore L_1 is a function of only two vector and one scalar arguments (coordinates $\boldsymbol{r}_t$, velocity $\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ and time t). Substituting such an L_1 instead of K into Eq. (21) we have

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f] = \frac{1}{\tau}\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-\Delta t} L_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t)\Delta t \tag{24}$$

We require integrability of L_1 on $\mathbb{R}$, in which case the complexity of continuous

dynamics (13) can be quantified by

$$\begin{aligned} S[f] &\equiv \frac{1}{\tau}\lim_{\Delta t\to 0}\lim_{|\bar{\xi}|\to\infty}\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-\Delta t} L_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \mathring{\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}}_t, t)\Delta t \\ &= \frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^{\tau} L_1(\boldsymbol{r}_t, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t)\, dt\ . \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Because of the formal connection of $S[f]$ to the physical laws through the minimization procedure we shall call L_1 the Lagrangian and $S[f]$ the corresponding action for a single free particle. Following the argument by Landau and Lifshitz ([11], §3,4), we note that the homogeneity and isotropy of space and homogeneity of time in an inertial reference frame imply that the Lagrangian L_1 can only depend on the absolute value of velocity

$$L_1(\boldsymbol{r}, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}, t) = L_1(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2) + \frac{d}{dt}\tilde{Q}(\xi_t)\ . \tag{26}$$

Here the total time derivative is introduced to emphasize that with fixed initial and final conditions the variational problem of minimizing $S[f]$ over all f is not affected by addition of any $d\tilde{Q}(\xi_t)/dt$ to the Lagrangian $L_1(\boldsymbol{r}, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}, t)$. The Galilean relativity principle requires that in the reference frame which moves with infinitesimal velocity $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ relative to the original inertial reference frame the Lagrangian $L_1(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}'^2) = L_1(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2 + 2\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}\cdot\boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^2)$ can differ from $L_1(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2)$ only by the total time derivative of some function of the particle state. This implies that $\partial L_1/\partial\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2$ does not depend on the velocity, because the second term in the expansion

$$L_1(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}'^2) = L_1(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2) + \frac{\partial L_1}{\partial \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2}2\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}\cdot\boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \ldots \tag{27}$$

is a total time derivative only if it is a linear function of $\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}$. Writing $\partial L_1/\partial\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2 = m/2$ and neglecting the total time derivative we have

$$L_1(\boldsymbol{r}, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}, t) = \frac{m\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2}{2}. \tag{28}$$

Because the variational problem of minimizing $K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f]$ with fixed initial and final conditions is not affected by addition of $\Delta\tilde{Q}(\bar{\xi}_t)/\Delta t$ to the complexity $K(\mathring{\mathring{\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}}}_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \mathring{\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}}_t, t) = L_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}, \mathring{\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}}_t, t)$, the above equation implies Eq. (22) as required. The standard derivation of the free particle Lagrangian L_1 used here gives equivalent results in any coordinate system: L_1 is always the kinetic energy. Likewise, our requirements on complexity are physically equivalent for different parameterizations $\{\bar{\xi}\}$ of the coarse-grained state space. The Galilean relativity principle demands (22), so that the choice of parameterization of the state space does not matter.

It now remains to show that the constraint on the form of the complexity imposed by the Galilean relativity principle can be satisfied by a considerable number of reference computers. Certainly, not every reference computer W would satisfy this. It is however not surprising because the definition of W is far too general. To prove that there is a W for which (22) is true, imagine that we have found the physical dynamical law. For this particular law there is a corresponding computer which by default (if given zero length program) calculates the physical value of $\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}$ from any $\langle \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t\rangle$. For such a computer, the minimal value of complexity $K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t) = 0$ is obtained for the physical law. This is achieved in the fixed reference frame $\mathcal{F}_0$ where the physical law was found. In order to perform computations in any given reference frame, we modify the computer to wait for a string of code which is appended to the main program. This appended code accommodates the definition of the given reference frame relative to the fixed $\mathcal{F}_0$, and reformulates the results of the main program in the given frame. We choose the fixed frame $\mathcal{F}_0$ as the rest frame of our free particle, and require that the appended code has the fixed length of $m\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^2/2 + c$, where c is a constant. The computer would read $\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ from the given data and perform calculations only if the appended code has the required length. Because c can be rather big the shortest program describing a dynamical law ${}^Jf$ would use the unnecessary space in the appended code to encode as much information about ${}^Jf$ as possible. In fact, for simple ${}^Jf$ the length of the shortest program will coincide with the length of the appended code. We therefore constructed a computer which satisfies requirement (22) for simple dynamical laws and, moreover, because we can choose c in a countably infinite number of ways, we know that there are at least a countably infinite number of computers which satisfy Eq. (22). This construction, although mathematically consistent, is rather artificial as the length of the appended code explicitely depends on the system state. This unpleasant feature disappears in the relativistic case where the appended code is not necessary. This completes the consideration of the case of a single nonrelativistic particle. The same arguments can be used to study the system of N noninteracting particles because they can be considered independently from one another.

To study the case of N interacting particles we split the total system state space $\mathbb{S} = \{\bar{\xi}_t\}$ into subspaces $\mathbb{S}^i = \{\bar{\xi}_t^i\}$ that correspond to individual particles so that $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^2 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{S}^N = \mathbb{S}$. One easy way to do this is to construct a state space for every particle $\mathbb{S}^i = \{\bar{\xi}_t^i\}$ and then use the bijection B to form the total state space as $\mathbb{S} = \{\bar{\xi}_t \mid \bar{\xi}_t = \langle \bar{\xi}_t^1, \ldots, \bar{\xi}_t^N\rangle\}$. Using (6), equation (21) for the entire system can be rewritten as

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^Jf] \;=\; \frac{1}{\tau}\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-\Delta t} K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^1_{t+\Delta t}, \ldots, \overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^N_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\xi}_t)\,\Delta t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\tau}\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-\Delta t}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^{n}_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\xi}_t) - V_N + E\right)\Delta t\ . \tag{29}$$

where E is a constant of motion and, up to the additive total time derivative,

$$V_N \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} I(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^{n}_{t+\Delta t} : \overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^{n+1}_{t+\Delta t}, \ldots, \overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^{N}_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\xi}_t)\ . \tag{30}$$

We have already mentioned that any interaction between subsystems manifests itself in the correlation of their dynamics. This correlation is quantified by the mutual information and, for this reason, we will call V_N the interaction term. Function (30) obviously contains the Newtonian case of binary interaction $V_N = \sum_{j<k} V_{jk}$ where V_{jk} stands for the interaction between particles j and k. In subsequent work we will present a more detailed study of V_N. Here we suppose that interaction between subsystems is known from experiment so that the interaction term is given as a function on the state space of the system. For simplicity we will consider the case when V_N is a function only of the coordinates $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}^n_t\}_{n=1}^N$. Moreover, it would be misleading to consider a more general case, since velocity dependent forces appear in mechanics as an attempt to include friction or electro-magnetic interactions. Friction is essentially an *effective* phenomenon: that is, there is no single fundamental interaction which describes friction without further approximations. Electro-magnetic interactions are also irrelevant as they are not Newtonian. For these reasons, velocity independent potentials are used as a standard requirement for fundamental derivations in nonrelativistic mechanics (Ref. [11], §5).

The question now is to determine $K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^{n}_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\xi}_t)$. During a sufficiently short interval of time Δt, the velocities of the particles can be treated as constants, which is analogous to the case of zero interaction. One can therefore repeat the arguments as in the case of Eq. (22), with the reservation that the coefficient m can depend on time and can be different for every particle in the system. Physically, this would correspond to the most general case when particles' masses are changing with time like, for instance, in jet motion. Mathematically, this possibility arises because the arguments should be repeated for every short interval of time Δt independently. In doing so we should treat $\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^{k}_{t+\Delta t}$ as a constant because it relates asymptotically constant velocities of the particles during different intervals Δt. As explained above, for sufficiently small Δt, we have:

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^{J}f] = \frac{1}{\tau}\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-\Delta t}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\frac{m_n(\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^{n}_{t})^2}{2} - V_N + E\right)\Delta t\ . \tag{31}$$

Discrete formulation of Newton's second law appears as a necessary condition for the variational problem of minimizing $K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^{J}f]$, which for the case of one

particle moving in a potential gives, as shown in the Appendix ,

$$\frac{\Delta}{\Delta t}[m(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t + \delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t/2)] = -\frac{\delta V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t})}{\delta \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t}} \ . \tag{32}$$

The right hand side of this equation is a discrete variational derivative as defined in the Appendix . We see that the acceleration is determined by the force acting on the particle in the immediately preceding past. We can therefore conclude that the force is the cause of acceleration in the inertial reference frame. Taking the continuum limit $|\bar{\xi}| \to \infty$ followed by $\Delta t \to 0$ we recover the standard formulation of Newton's second law

$$\frac{d}{dt}(m\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}) = -\frac{dV(\boldsymbol{r})}{d\boldsymbol{r}} \ . \tag{33}$$

Note that for the investigation of causality and related topics such as the arrow of time, our discrete formulation of Newton's second law is better suited than the standard formulation. We shall leave these topics for further research and proceed with important special cases where the difference between the discrete and the differential formulations of dynamical laws can be neglected. In these cases the differential form of the dynamical laws can be determined by applying techniques of standard variational calculus for minimizing the functional

$$A_S \equiv a \int_0^\tau \left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{m_n(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^n)^2}{2} - V_N + E \right) dt \tag{34}$$

with the fixed end points $\bar{\xi}_0$ and $\bar{\xi}_\tau$. The connection between equations (34) and (31) suggests that, for small enough τ, this functional must be positive definite and have a minimum for some fixed values of the constants a and E.

Now we shall address the question of whether A_S is positive definite and has a minimum in the context of the physical meaning of E. For any function $V_N = V_N(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^1, \ldots, \bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^N)$ and constant values of $\{m_n\}_{n=1}^N$ the Euler-Lagrange equations for A_S imply that

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{m_n(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^n)^2}{2} + V_N) = 0 \ , \tag{35}$$

which is the well known law of conservation of energy. Since E is a constant of motion it may only depend on fundamental constants and integrals of motion. In our case the energy is generally the only such integral of motion. Since V_N belongs to a very broad class of functions the only way to ensure that A_S is positive definite is to require that E contains V_N with the plus sign to

compensate $-V_N$ in the Lagrangian. Therefore it is necessary that up to an insignificant constant, which can be absorbed in (35), we have

$$E = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{m_n(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^n)^2}{2} + V_N \ . \tag{36}$$

For sufficiently small τ, this value of E corresponds to a positive definite A_S which has a minimum as required. Indeed, substitution of (36) into (34) gives

$$A_S = a \int_0^\tau \sum_{n=1}^{N} m_n(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^n)^2 \ dt \tag{37}$$

which for $a > 0$ is a sum of essentially positive terms. The minimum should be found using the additional requirement (36) as an auxiliary condition. To emphasize the analogy with the relativistic case considered in the next subsection, we reformulate this result in purely geometrical terms [15]. The coordinate transformation from the Cartesian (x_n, y_n, z_n) to other generalized coordinates q_j implies that there exists symmetric m_{jk} such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} m_n(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^n)^2 = \frac{\sum_{j,k} m_{jk} dq_j dq_k}{(dt)^2} \ . \tag{38}$$

Using the condition (36) we have

$$[\sum_{n=1}^{N} m_n(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^n)^2 dt]^2 = \sum_{j,k} 2(E - V_N) m_{jk} dq_j dq_k \ , \tag{39}$$

and therefore the symmetric matrix

$$g_{jk} \equiv 2(E - V_N) m_{jk} \tag{40}$$

can be used to define a line element of the form

$$(dl)^2 \equiv \sum_{jk} g_{jk} dq_j dq_k \ . \tag{41}$$

Using the definitions (40,41) and Eq. (39), we can rewrite (37) as

$$A_S = a \int_{\xi_0}^{\xi_\tau} dl \ , \tag{42}$$

where we emphasize that the sign of a must be chosen to compensate the sign degeneracy $dl = \pm\sqrt{(dl)^2}$, that is to keep (42) a minimum principle. Equation (42) shows that the minimum principle is equivalent to the problem of finding a geodesic path between two fixed end-points ξ_0 and ξ_τ in the system's configuration space defined by the Riemannian metric g_{jk}. The metric in its turn was derived using only

- the *SP*, and
- the Galilean principle of relativity.

4.2 Relativity

In the previous section we demonstrated our approach using the example of a conservative nonrelativistic mechanical system. Our arguments can be summarized into three stages. First, we used the *SP* and the properties of Kolmogorov complexity to obtain Hamilton's principle of least action together with the general structure of Lagrangians. Second, we used the classical arguments by Landau and Lifshitz to specify the Lagrangians of individual particles. Third, we constructed a reference computer to check whether the second stage is consistent with our choice of Kolmogorov complexity as a measure of complexity for dynamical laws.

In this section we consider the case of relativistic systems. The first stage of our arguments is identical to the one of the nonrelativistic case. This means that in this section we can start our arguments directly from the second stage, i.e. consider one particle cases such as a free relativistic particle and a relativistic particle in an external gravitational field. To do this this we will need to replace the Galilean principle with Einstein's principle of relativity. For the third stage of the argument we can use the arguments of the previous section as a template.

We will see that the derivations of this section are considerably simpler and more natural than in the case of Newtonian mechanics. In particular, we do not construct an integrable and twice differentiable interpolation L_1 of the complexity function. More simplification is achieved in the construction of examples of reference computers which are consistent with our derivations. In the nonrelativistic case we required that the reference computer should be supplied with a description of the reference frame where the problem is formulated. Such a description can be supplied in the form of code which is appended to the main program. In the nonrelativistic case we showed that the appended code of fixed length $m\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t^2/2 + \text{const}$ does the job. Even though this is a mathematically consistent requirement, it is rather artificial that the length of the code depends on the system state. We will see that the analogous construction in the relativistic case does not require the appended code at all. At the end of this section we outline the possibility of geometrical formulations of our approach and show how one can derive the theory of particle motion in an external gravitational field.

The physical state of a relativistic mechanical system is described by the same

set of parameters $\xi_k = (\boldsymbol{r}_k, \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_k, t_k)$ as in the case of a Newtonian mechanical system. The concept of absolute time, however, is in deep contradiction with the Einstein principle of relativity. For this reason it is not convenient to choose time as the abstract parameter k in Eq. (14) as it was done in the case of Newtonian mechanics. If c is the speed of light, the Einstein principle of relativity for the case of homogeneous isotropic space and homogeneous time suggests that the quantity

$$(\Delta s)^2 = c^2(\Delta t)^2 - (\Delta x)^2 - (\Delta y)^2 - (\Delta z)^2 \,, \tag{43}$$

is the same in all inertial reference frames. It is convenient to choose this quantity for the parameterization in Eq. (14) in the same way as time was chosen in the case of Newtonian mechanics. Fixing the limits of parameterization $s \in [0, \varsigma]$ we have, by analogy with Eq. (21),

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f] = \frac{1}{\varsigma} \sum_{s=0}^{\varsigma - \Delta s} K(\bar{\xi}_{s+\Delta s} | \bar{\xi}_s)\, \Delta s \,, \tag{44}$$

where the sum over s goes from 0 to $\varsigma - \Delta s$ in steps of Δs.

The Einstein principle of relativity requires that the dynamical laws obtained by minimization of $K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f]$ must be invariant with respect to the Lorentz transformations which relate different inertial reference frames to each other. Considering the case of one free particle, we also have the requirement of homogeneity of the space and time which requires that $K(\bar{\xi}_{s+\Delta s}|\bar{\xi}_s)$ cannot depend on the time or the coordinates of the particle, i.e. is a function only of the four-velocity

$$u \equiv (u^0, u^1, u^2, u^3) \equiv (\frac{\Delta ct}{\Delta s}, \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta s}, \frac{\Delta y}{\Delta s}, \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta s}) \,. \tag{45}$$

The Lorentz transformations can be considered as rotations in four-dimensional space with the metric $g^{jk} = \mathrm{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$. This means that $K(\bar{\xi}_{s+\Delta s}|\bar{\xi}_s)$ cannot depend on the *direction* of the four-velocity. Since $u_j u_k g^{jk} = 1$, the absolute value of the four-velocity is a constant and therefore

$$K(\bar{\xi}_{s+\Delta s}|\bar{\xi}_s) = \mathrm{const} + \frac{\Delta Q}{\Delta s} \,, \tag{46}$$

where Q is an arbitrary function of the system state. This equation is a relativistic analogue of Eq. (22). Substitution of (46) into (44) gives

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^J f] = a \sum_{s=0}^{\varsigma - \Delta s} \Delta s \,. \tag{47}$$

Choosing $\Delta s = +\sqrt{(\Delta s)^2}$ we see that $K_{\bar{\xi}_0}$ has a minimum for negative a. In the usual case, when dynamical laws can be interpolated by twice differentiable functions, the above equation becomes

$$A_S^{\rm rel} = a \int_0^{\varsigma} ds + \text{const}\,. \tag{48}$$

Minimization of this quantity over possible dynamical laws gives the known equations of motion for a free relativistic particle. In other words, the *SP* combined with the Einstein principle of relativity is enough to obtain the Lagrangian of a free relativistic particle.

As in the case of Eq. (22), we must show that there exists a considerable number of reference computers which satisfy requirement (46). This can be shown by repeating the arguments of the previous section. As in the nonrelativistic case we obtain a family of countably infinitely many computers which satisfy requirement (46). This time, however, the arguments can be simplified since the left-hand-side of (46) does not contain terms quadratic in velocity. Moreover, the constant term in (46) can be absorbed into $\Delta Q/\Delta s$ which means that the appended code, artificially required in the Newtonian mechanics, is not necessary in the relativistic case.

It remains to show that $A_S^{\rm rel}$ can be made positive definite. Writing the constant as $acE\tau$, where E is an integral of motion and τ is the time elapsed between the boundary events ξ_0 and ξ_ς we have

$$A_S^{\rm rel} = ac \int_0^{\tau} (\sqrt{1 - \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2/c^2} + E)\ dt\ . \tag{49}$$

This equation is a relativistic analogue of Eq. (34) in the case of one particle. As in Newtonian mechanics, it is easy to see that $A_S^{\rm rel}$ is positive definite when E is equal to the energy of the system. Indeed, for small $\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2$ equation (49) becomes

$$A_S^{\rm rel} = \int_0^{\tau} (-mc^2 + \frac{m\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2}{2} + ... + E)\ dt\ , \tag{50}$$

where $m \equiv |a|/c$. For small $\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}$ the relativistic energy of a particle is $(mc^2 + m\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2/2 + ...)$; therefore E contains $+mc^2$ compensating the negative term in (50), and $A_S^{\rm rel}$ is positive as required. The action remains positive definite for any values of $\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}$ because the relativistic energy grows monotonically with $\dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^2$.

Looking at equations (48) and (42), we see that the problem of identifying a predominant dynamical law is equivalent to the problem of finding a geodesic path between two fixed end-points in the system configuration space. The metric of the configuration space is again determined only by the *SP* combined with the Galilean or Einstein's principles of relativity. The case of a

particle in an external gravitational field trivially fits this scheme [16]. Einstein's principle of equivalence requires that an external gravitational field can be introduced as an appropriate change in the metric of space-time, that is as a change in the expression of ds in terms of dx, dy, dz and dt. Equation (42) has the same form for all such expressions, and the requirement of minimum of A_S^{rel} gives the standard equations of motion for a particle in an external gravitational field [16].

5 Discussion

We introduced a new *physical* principle – the Simplicity Principle. It is based on the classical principle of Occam's Razor which is a cornerstone of the modern theory of induction and machine learning. Using the Simplicity Principle, we explained the general structure of the Lagrangian for a composite physical system. In fact, we explained all generic postulates of the Lagrangian formulation of physical dynamics. We demonstrated our approach using the examples of Newtonian mechanics, relativistic mechanics and the motion of a relativistic particle in an external gravitational field. We thereby establish a non-trivial link between the Simplicity Principle and the principle of stationary action.

We have already mentioned that singling out the simplest hypothesis is not the optimal strategy of inductive inference. Ideally, we should consider all possible dynamical laws $\{f\}$ weighted in accordance with their complexity $2^{-K_x[f]}$. This is reminiscent of the Feynman path integrals approach to quantization. At present, in quantum field theory a typical derivation of Feynman path integrals from first principles cannot be considered mathematically rigorous [17]. There are problems with convergence and with analytic continuation from Minkowski space to Euclidean space. Using Kolmogorov complexity instead of Euclidean action would improve the convergence while preserving all results that can be attributed to the contributions of simple laws. Indeed, as suggested by the Kraft inequality, sums of the type $\sum_f 2^{-K_x[f]}$ are convergent: this is not always the case with Feynman path integrals. Moreover, there is some independent evidence [18] that at least a qualitative relationship between the Euclidean action and Kolmogorov complexity should exist. Using Kolmogorov complexity instead of the Euclidean action may also be useful for quantum gravity [19] where, among others, the indefiniteness of the gravitational action is a serious problem [20]. These and other applications of the proposed approach are a matter for further research.

Appendix

To a large extent, the standard derivation of the Euler-Lagrange equations is based on the well-known method of integration by parts. Here we briefly review its discrete analogue – Abel's method of "summation by parts". We then apply this method to derive (32).

Summation by parts

Let

$$\mathtt{U}_J \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{J} \mathtt{u}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathtt{V}_J \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{J} \mathtt{v}_k \ , \tag{51}$$

where we adopt the usual convention that if $b < a$ then $\sum_{k=a}^{b} F(k) = 0$ for any function F. The integration by parts method can most easily be demonstrated as a consequence of the Leibnitz rule

$$d(\mathtt{UV}) = \mathtt{U}d(\mathtt{V}) + \mathtt{V}d(\mathtt{U}) \ . \tag{52}$$

By analogy we therefore compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathtt{U}_k\mathtt{V}_k - \mathtt{U}_{k-1}\mathtt{V}_{k-1} &= \mathtt{U}_k(\mathtt{V}_k - \mathtt{V}_{k-1}) + \mathtt{V}_{k-1}(\mathtt{U}_k - \mathtt{U}_{k-1}) \\ &= \mathtt{U}_k\mathtt{v}_k + \mathtt{V}_{k-1}\mathtt{u}_k \ . \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Summation from $k = 0$ to $k = J$ gives

$$\mathtt{U}_J\mathtt{V}_J = \sum_{k=0}^{J} \mathtt{U}_k\mathtt{v}_k + \sum_{k=1}^{J} \mathtt{V}_{k-1}\mathtt{u}_k \ . \tag{54}$$

This "summation by parts" formula can be used for manipulating discrete sums just like the integration by parts is used to manipulate integrals. In particular, we can derive Eq. (32) as a discrete analogue of the Euler-Lagrange equations as follows. In Eqs. (51,54) we replace the abstract summation index k with the time t, as explained for Eqs. (19) and (21), to get (using the earlier defined notation)

$$\mathtt{U}_J = \sum_{k=0}^{J} \mathtt{u}_k = \sum_{t=0}^{\tau} \mathtt{u}_t \equiv \mathtt{U}_\tau \ , \tag{55}$$

where $\mathtt{u}_t = \mathtt{U}_t - \mathtt{U}_{t-\Delta t} = \Delta\mathtt{U}_t$. Writing analogous relations for $\mathtt{V}_t$ and $\mathtt{v}_t$, we can rewrite Eq. (54) as

$$\mathtt{U}_\tau\mathtt{V}_\tau = \sum_{t=0}^{\tau} \mathtt{U}_t\Delta\mathtt{V}_t + \sum_{t=\Delta t}^{\tau} \mathtt{V}_{t-\Delta t}\Delta\mathtt{U}_t \ . \tag{56}$$

One particle in a potential

The case of one particle moving in a potential $V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)$ is built upon the approximation that the particle interacts with a massive system which determines the potential, and whose dynamics are not sensitive to the particle motion. Mathematically, such an approximation is performed as follows. The complexity of the dynamical law ${}^Jf$ for the whole system has the form

$$K_{\bar{\xi}_0}[{}^Jf] \propto \sum_{t=0}^{\tau-\Delta t} K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}, \overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^1_{t+\Delta t}, \dots \overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^N_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\xi}_t)\Delta t \ , \tag{57}$$

where the upper indices from 1 to N refer to the particles of the massive system. Formally separating our particle from the massive system we have from (31)

$$K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}, \overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^1_{t+\Delta t}, \dots \overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^N_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\xi}_t) = \frac{m\,(\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)^2}{2} - \Big[V_{N+1} - \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{m_n\,(\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^n_t)^2}{2}\Big] + \text{const} \ . \tag{58}$$

To make the above approximation we assume that the equations of motion for the massive system are known and are not affected by the motion of our particle. This means that variables $\{\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^n_t\}$ can be eliminated and the expression in square brackets can be replaced by an *effective* interaction $V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)$:

$$K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}, \overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^1_{t+\Delta t}, \dots \overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}{}^N_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\xi}_t) \approx K(\overset{\circ\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t+\Delta t}|\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, \overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t, t) \equiv \frac{m\,(\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)^2}{2} - V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t) + \text{const} \ . \tag{59}$$

Although useful in practice, this approximation ruins the connection between the interaction and the mutual information. Effective interaction $V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)$ has contributions from the kinetic energy terms and it strongly depends on the assumed equations of motion. Thus, the information-theoretic interpretation of the interaction terms in the Lagrangian is only valid for the fundamental interactions: before any approximations are made.

For simplicity, we shall consider the case of one dimensional motion, where $\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ can be considered as scalars. Generalization to the multidimensional case is essentially trivial. We define the discrete variation in absolute analogy with standard variational calculus

$$\delta V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t) \equiv V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t + \delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t) - V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t) \ , \tag{60}$$

where $\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ is a virtual change of the function $\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$. For instance if $T(\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t) \equiv m\,(\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)^2/2$ then

$$\delta T(\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t) = \frac{m}{2}[(\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t + \delta\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)^2 - (\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)^2] = m\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t\delta\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t + m\,(\delta\overset{\circ}{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)^2/2 \ . \tag{61}$$

To minimize the sum (57) we require that, up to second order in $\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ and $\delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$,

$$\delta \sum_{t=0}^{\tau-\Delta t} \Big[T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t) - V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)\Big]\,\Delta t \equiv \sum_{t=0}^{\tau-\Delta t} \Big[\delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t) - \delta V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)\Big]\,\Delta t = 0\,. \tag{62}$$

Because we do not vary the functions $\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ and $\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ at the end points $t = 0$ and $t = \tau$, we have $\delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_\tau) = 0$ and therefore (62) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\tau} \delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)\Delta t - \sum_{t=\Delta t}^{\tau} \delta V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t})\Delta t = 0\,. \tag{63}$$

Noticing that

$$\delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t = \frac{\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t - \delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t}}{\Delta t} = \frac{\Delta\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t}{\Delta t} \tag{64}$$

we have

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\tau} \delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)\,\Delta t = \sum_{t=0}^{\tau} \frac{\delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)}{\delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t}\,\Delta\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t\,, \tag{65}$$

where it is understood that $\delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_\tau)/\delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_\tau = 0$ as required by the transition from Eq. (62) to Eq. (63). Setting $\mathtt{U}_t = \delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)/\delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ and $\mathtt{V}_t = \delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$ for all t, we use summation by parts (56) to show

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\tau} \frac{\delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)}{\delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t}\,\Delta\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t = -\sum_{t=\Delta t}^{\tau} \delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t}\,\Delta\frac{\delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)}{\delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t}\,. \tag{66}$$

Combining Eqs. (63) and (66), we have, up to second order in $\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_t$,

$$\sum_{t=\Delta t}^{\tau} \left[\frac{\Delta}{\Delta t}\frac{\delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)}{\delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t} + \frac{\delta V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t})}{\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t}}\right] \delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t}\,\Delta t = 0\,. \tag{67}$$

This must be true for arbitrary values of $\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t}$ and therefore we demand

$$\frac{\Delta}{\Delta t}\frac{\delta T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)}{\delta\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t} + \frac{\delta V(\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t})}{\delta\bar{\boldsymbol{r}}_{t-\Delta t}} = 0\,. \tag{68}$$

Now substituting $T(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t) = m\,(\mathring{\boldsymbol{r}}_t)^2/2$ and using Eq. (61) we have (32) as required.

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Dominik Janzing, R. E. Wilson, James B. Hartle, A. S. Johnson, Todd A. Brun and especially to Jens G. Jensen and Rüdiger Schack for their interest, support and discussions. A part of this work was completed at the Isaac Newton Institute in Cambridge, the hospitality of which is gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] M. Li and P. Vitányi, *An introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications* (Springer-Verlag New York, ed. 2, 1997).

[2] R. Solomonoff, "A formal theory of inductive inference", part 1 and part 2 *Inform. Contr.* **7** 1 and 224 (1964).

[3] P. Vitányi and M. Li, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **46** (2000) 446 and references therein; also available as *LANL e-print cs.LG/9901014* (1999).

[4] A. N. Kolmogorov, "Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information", *Problems Inform. Transmission* **1**, 1 (1965).

[5] R. Solomonoff, "A preliminary report on a general theory of inductive inference", *Tech. Rep. No. ZTB-138* (Zator Company, Cambridge, Mass., 1960).

[6] G. J. Chaitin, "On the lengths of programs for computing finite binary sequences: statistical considerations", *J. ACM* **16**, 145 (1969).

[7] L. A. Levin, "Laws of information conservation (non-growth) and aspects of the foundation of probability theory", *Problems Inform. Transmission* **10**, 206 (1974); "Various measures of complexity for finite objects (axiomatic description)", *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **17**, 522 (1976).

[8] P. Gács, "On the symmetry of algorithmic information", *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **15**, 1477 (1974); correction *ibid* **15** 1480 (1974).

[9] G. J. Chaitin, "A theory of program size formally identical to information theory", *J. ACM* **22**, 329 (1975).

[10] A. N. Soklakov, "Complexity analysis for algorithmically simple strings", *LANL e-print cs.LG/0009001* (2000).

[11] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Mechanics, Course of Theoretical Physics vol.1* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, ed. 3, 1998).

[12] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, London, ed. 2, 1980).

[13] L. H. Ryder, *Quantum Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, ed. 2, 1996), p. 85.

[14] R. P. Feynman, *Theory of Fundamental Processes* (W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1962), p. 87.

[15] C. Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics* (Dover Publications, New York, ed. 4, 1970), p. 14.

[16] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields, Course of Theoretical Physics vol.2* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, ed. 4, 1989), chap. 10 §87.

[17] P. Ramond, *Field Theory: A Modern Primer* (Benjamin/Cummings, London, 1981).

[18] C. H. Woo, "Quantum field theory and algorithmic complexity", *Phys. Lett.* **168B**, 376 (1986).

[19] V. D. Dzhunushaliev, "Kolmogorov's algorithmic complexity and its probability interpretation in quantum gravity", *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15**, 603 (1998).

[20] G. W. Gibbons, S. W. Hawking, and M. J. Perry, "Path integrals and the indefiniteness of the gravitational action" *Nucl. Phys* **B138**, 141 (1978).